

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LARRY D. JULIO,

Defendant and Appellant.

D067376

(Super. Ct. No. SCD259203)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Charles R. Gill, Judge. Affirmed.

Gary V. Crooks, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Respondent.

Pursuant to a plea agreement with a stipulated sentence, Larry D. Julio entered a guilty plea to one count of selling or furnishing a controlled substance (Health & Saf. Code, § 11379, subd. (a)). The parties stipulated to a three-year split sentence, 18 months

to be served in custody and 18 months under supervision. The remaining counts were dismissed. Julio was sentenced in accordance with the plea agreement.

Julio filed a timely notice of appeal. His request for a certificate of probable cause was denied (Pen. Code, § 1237.50).

Appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). Counsel indicates he has been unable to identify any reasonably arguable issue for reversal on appeal. Counsel asks this court to review the record as mandated by *Wende*. We offered Julio the opportunity to file his own brief on appeal, but he has not responded.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Julio admitted to the probation officer that he sold methamphetamine to another person on June 12, 2014.

DISCUSSION

As we have indicated, appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, and has asked this court to review the record for error. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*) counsel has identified the following possible, but not arguable issue to assist this court in our review of the record:

Whether the trial court abused its discretion in selecting the middle term sentence in conformance with the plea agreement.

We have reviewed the entire record as mandated by *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders, supra*, 386 U.S. 738. We have not identified any reasonably arguable issue for reversal on appeal. Competent counsel has represented Julio on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

BENKE, J.

HALLER, J.